# **CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION**

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	<b>✓</b> Force	☑ Discourt.	U.S.
Arthur Albano		Squad #4	201506210	☑ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct	t: 18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Monday, 07/27/2015 4:00 PM		§ 87(2)(b)		42	1/27/2017	1/27/2017
Date/Time CV Reported CV		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported	Date/T	Date/Time Received at CCRB	
Tue, 07/28/2015 9:29 AM		CCRB E-mail		Tue, 07/28/2015 9:29 AM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ess			
Witness(es)		Home Addre	ess			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. POM Christophe Davis	00188	938322	042 PCT			
2. POM Dennis Vargas	07471	957245	042 PCT			
Officer(s)	Allegatio	on		I	nvestigator Reco	mmendation
A.POM Christophe Davis	Abuse: PO Christopher Davis entered					
D DOLLD	§ 87(2)(b)		in the Bronx.			
B.POM Dennis Vargas	Abuse: PO Dennis Vargas entered in the Bronx.					
C.POM Christophe Davis	Discourtesy: PO Christopher Davis spoke rudely to \$87(2)(b)					
D.POM Christophe Davis	Force: PO Christopher Davis used physical force against \$87(2)(b)					
E.POM Dennis Vargas	Force: PO Dennis Vargas used physical force against \$87(2)(b)					

### **Case Summary**

<u>Case Summary</u>
On July 27, 2015, at approximately 3:30 p.m., \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ s property management called 911 to report that \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was causing a disturbance in their office. After realizing that the property management made this call, \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ retreated to his home, which was across the street, at \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ in the Bronx. A few minutes after he got back to his apartment, his friend, \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ who had been present in the property management office during the alleged disturbance, and \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ s home health aide, \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ also entered \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ s apartment.  At approximately 4:00 p.m., PO Christopher Davis and PO Dennis Vargas, of the 42 <sup>nd</sup> Precinct arrived at \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ s home in response to the 911 call. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ began recording the conversation as soon as he opened the door. Due to this interaction, PO Davis and PO Vargas entered \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ s apartment without consent (Allegation A and B). \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ s video captured PO Davis calling \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ so video (Allegation C). \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ into the residence (Allegation D). PO Vargas allegedly pushed \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ making contact with his left arm (Allegation E). At the conclusion of the physical struggle, PO Davis and PO Vargas left the residence. No arrests were made or summonses issued.
provided video footage recorded from his cell phone capturing his interaction with PO Davis and PO Vargas. The video confirms that PO Davis blocked soor from closing and PO Vargas stepped inside and placed his foot at the base of the doorway while \$87(2)(b) was yelling at them to get out. It also captures PO Davis calling first. The video also shows \$87(2)(b) pushing PO Davis away from his door and then \$87(2)(b) placing his phone face down. While \$87(2)(b) s phone was down, only audio was captured which corroborates that at least PO Davis entered \$87(2)(b) s apartment and used physical force against him while yelling, "You do not touch me" and asking, "Do you want to touch me again?" (For transcription see Board Review 1)
Full Video Footage (edited footage available within analysis sections):  Jonathan Cowden Cell- 201506210.mp4  The building video footage of the seventh floor hallway of \$87(2)(b)
captures PO Davis and PO Vargas knocking on the door, entering, and exiting the apartment.  Since the cameras are motion detected cameras, there are lapses in the video at times when there is no one in the hallway. This video corroborates PO Vargas' and PO Davis' entry into apartment.

Full hallway video footage:



### **Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories**

- rejected mediation as an alternative resolution to this complaint.
- As of September 23, 2015, \$87(2)(b) has not filed a notice of claim against the city of New York in regards to this incident.
- § 87(2)(b)

## **Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories**

- § 87(2)(b)
- PO Davis has been a member of the service for ten years. This is the first CCRB complaint filed against him.
- PO Vargas has been a member of the service for one year. This is the first CCRB complaint filed against him.

#### **Findings and Recommendations**

rindings and recommendations
Allegation A- Abuse of Authority- PO Christopher Davis entered § 87(2)(6)
in the Bronx.
Allegation B- Abuse of Authority- PO Dennis Vargas entered 887(2)(b)
in the Bronx.
§ 87(2)(g)
On July 27, 2015, 37(2)(5) attempted to legally represent his friend, 37(2)(5) in a tenant dispute with their property management resulting in the management group calling 911 to report harassment. PO Davis and PO Vargas responded to the management group's office and were informed that 37(2)(5) had returned to his residence located at 37(2)(5) in the Bronx.  The management group did not file a criminal complaint against 37(2)(5) and solely requested the officers to inform him that he could not act as a legal representative for polymer and PO Vargas further confirmed that they had no intention of arresting when they arrived at his apartment. Upon their arrival, the officers interacted with their conversation by closing his door and informed the officers that they could not come in to his residence. The closing door was stopped by PO Vargas' foot against the base of the door and PO Davis' hand, which pushed the door fully open again. PO Davis stepped further into apartment, resulting in more verbal and physical protests by 37(2)(5) for the officers to leave his residence. PO Davis responded to some of these comments by saying, "If I don't leave 37(2)(5) what are you going to do, 37(2)(5) pushed his arm off the door. PO Davis stated that the reason he held the door open was so he could finish informing 37(2)(5) that he was not allowed to go into the property management's office to act as a legal representative.
CCRB consistent up to this point with both the officers and \$87(2)(b) identified an officer consistent with PO Davis' description as pushing \$87(2)(b) through the kitchen, and living room area causing a kitchen cart and other items to fall in the apartment. He confirmed that PO Vargas solely walked in behind his partner. \$87(2)(b) provided a brief phone statement to the CCRB and asked not to be called again. \$87(2)(b) did not differentiate between both officers, but also confirmed that the extent of the entry and the physical force used by solely one officer.
The audio provided by \$87(2)(b) captured crashing sounds, and PO Davis' stressed voice yelling, "You do not touch me," and "Do you want to touch me again?" while \$87(2)(b) yells, "Get," "Get out of my apartment Davis," and "Go" multiple times. The officers acknowledged that PO Davis made physical contact with \$87(2)(b) but indicated that it only took place once,

denied further entry into the residence and could not account for the crashing sounds captured by the audio recording.



Entry 201506210.mp4

Entries into a person's home without a warrant are presumptively unreasonable. The Fourth Amendment has drawn a firm line at the entrance of the house. Absent exigent circumstances, that threshold may not be reasonably crossed without a warrant. Payton v. New York 445 U.S. 573 (1980). When an officer does not have sufficient justification to enter a person's home that officer placing his foot in the doorway of the home is considered not legally present in the home. People v. Reese 5 Misc. 3d 1030(A) (Board Review 3)

§ 8/(2)(b), § 8/(2)(g)
Allegation C – Discourtesy- PO Christopher Davis spoke rudely to 887(2)(6)
The video footage from §87(2)(b) s phone captures §87(2)(b) calling PO Davis
and moments thereafter, PO Davis states, "If I don't leave \$87(2)(6) what are you going to
do, \$87(2)(b) Later in the interaction, PO Davis states to \$87(2)(b) "So would you like to stay
here all day?
PO Davis did not have any explanation for calling \$87(2)(b) (\$87(2)(b) or \$87(2)
and stated that he didn't recall having said it, even after being presented the video
footage.
100mgc.
Discourtesy 201506210.mp4

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 requires officers to be courteous and respectful when dealing with the public. <u>Police Department v. Teeter</u> held that even when officers are confronted with hostile, defiant, or provocative in manner, officers are still required to maintain a certain decorum and professionalism in their conduct OATH Index No. 590/01. Similarly, <u>Police Department v. Kidert Jean-Mary</u> held that officers are not permitted to use insults solely as retaliation for a civilian's conduct. OATH Index No. 129/07. (Board Review 4)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)		
Allegation D- Force- PO Christop	har Davis usad physical f	orce against \$87/2/b
Allegation E- Force- PO Dennis V		
§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)	angus usou pri, sieur rores	
- TO!		- 11: DOD : 1 1 1
not touch him again and that he (PO responded, "I wasn't trying to hurt y he was struggling with PO Davis insthe audio captured a struggle with P	Davis) hit "like a fucking you sir, I really wasn't." side of the residence, PO V	further alleged that once argas pushed him once. None of
made physical contact with § 87(2)(b)		
brief, he did not differentiate between		
make any physical contact with § 87(2		
Both officers indicated that		
had pushed him and that this occurr		
interaction captured in the audio. Bo	oth officers denied that PO	Vargas made physical contact with
\$ 67(2)(6)		
Force 201506210.mp4		
·	ura 202 11 states that office	ers are required to use the minimal
necessary force. (Board Review 6)	ure 203-11 states that offic	ers are required to use the minimar
§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)		
Squad: 4		
- quius		
Investigator:	Arthur Albano	
Signature	Print	Date
Dod I andow		
Pod Leader: Title/Signature	Print	Date
Title/Signature	1 11111	Date
Attorney:		
Title/Signature	Print	Date